

## **POSTDOCTORAL RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIP IN THE EDUCATION SCIENCES**

CFDA NUMBER: CFDA 84.305

RELEASE DATE: May 6, 2005

REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS: NCER-06-06

Institute of Education Sciences

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/edresearch/applicant.html>

LETTER OF INTENT RECEIPT DATE: June 6, 2005

APPLICATION RECEIPT DATE: July 21, 2005

THIS REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS CONTAINS THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

1. Request for Applications
2. Purpose of the Training Fellowship
3. Background
4. Requirements of the Proposed Training Fellowship
5. Applications Available
6. Mechanism of Support
7. Funding Available
8. Eligible Applicants
9. Special Requirements
10. Letter of Intent
11. Submitting an Application
12. Contents and Page Limits of Application
13. Application Processing
14. Peer Review Process
15. Review Criteria
16. Receipt and Review Schedule
17. Award Decisions
18. Where to Send Inquiries
19. Program Authority
20. Applicable Regulations
21. References

### **1. REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS**

The Institute of Education Sciences (Institute) invites applications for its Postdoctoral Research Training Fellowship in the Education Sciences. For this competition, the Institute will consider only applications that meet the requirements outlined below under the section on Requirements of the Proposed Training Fellowship.

## **2. PURPOSE OF THE TRAINING FELLOWSHIP**

The Institute's objectives in creating the Postdoctoral Research Training Fellowship in the Education Sciences are to support the training of postdoctoral fellows interested in conducting applied education research and to produce a cadre of education researchers willing and able to conduct a new generation of methodologically rigorous and educationally relevant scientific research that will provide solutions to pressing problems and challenges facing American education.

## **3. BACKGROUND**

A number of recent reports have described current education practice as not resting on a solid research base (Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy, 2002; National Research Council 1999, 2000, 2002). Instead, policy decisions are often guided by personal experience, folk wisdom, and ideology. Grounding education policy and practice in the United States on evidence will require a transformation of the field. Practitioners will have to turn routinely to education research when making important decisions, and education researchers will have to produce research that is relevant to those decisions. To achieve this ambitious agenda, there is a need for a cadre of well-trained scientists capable of conducting high quality research that is relevant to practitioners and policy makers.

There are significant capacity issues within the education research community. According to a recent survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center, only 7 percent of doctorate recipients in the field of Education cite research and development as their primary postdoctoral activity (Hoffer et.al., 2003). Similarly, a recent membership survey conducted by the American Educational Research Association (AERA) revealed that less than a quarter of its membership cite research as being their major responsibility (AERA, 2002). Perhaps even more worrisome, the number of Education doctorate recipients in the subfields of Education Statistics/Research Methods and Educational Assessment, Testing and Measures is extremely low compared to other subfields. This imbalance has remained consistent over the course of the past ten years (American Psychological Association (APA) Research Office, 2004; Hoffer, et.al., 2003). The situation is no better in closely related disciplines. For instance, the number of doctoral degrees awarded annually in educational psychology has declined from 144 in 1978 to 48 in 2001 (Hoffer et al., 2003). Compounding this decline, of the 48 doctoral degree recipients in 2001, only 16 reported being involved in research within one year of the receipt of their degree (APA Research Office, 2004). Transforming education into an evidence-based field will require training new researchers in sufficient numbers to address the many tasks at hand.

There are also significant issues pertaining to the nature of the training that is currently being provided by graduate programs. Many schools of education are not providing rigorous research training for doctoral students. Although research training that is relevant to education is often provided elsewhere in universities (e.g., psychology and economics departments), these disciplines are seldom focused on education topics, and students are pointed towards other careers and research interests. Moreover, there seems to be a mismatch between what education decision-makers want from the education research community and what the education research community is providing. Education practitioners need research to help them make informed decisions in those areas in which they have choices to make, such as curriculum and teacher professional development. They want the research and development enterprise to generate valid

and useable assessment instruments. They want information on the relative costs and benefits of different education investments.

Many of the questions raised by practitioners and policy makers require answers to questions of what works in education for whom and under what circumstances. These are causal questions that are best answered by research using randomized controlled trials or well-designed quasi-experimental designs. Yet, these are questions and methods with which relatively few in the education research community have been engaged. Although the total number of articles featuring randomized field trials in other areas of social science research has steadily grown over the past 30 years, the number of randomized trials in education has lagged far behind (Boruch, de Moya & Snyder, 2001; Cook, 2001), and the use of quantitative methods has become subordinate to the use of qualitative and narrative approaches. The dominance of qualitative methods in research reports in leading education research journals and the dominance of what works questions among practitioners is a clear sign of the mismatch between the focus of the practice community and the current research community.

Another category of questions raised by the practice community focuses on assessment. The standards and accountability movement has generated a ballooning demand for people who are trained in the design, implementation, analysis, and use of education tests and measures to assess the results of instruction, to aid in the selection and promotion of staff, and to support the management of schools and districts. Individuals with skills in psychometrics are needed throughout the education sector, from federal statistics agencies to state education agencies, from test developers to local school districts. However, no more than 15 Psychology doctoral degrees in psychometrics have been awarded in a given year since 1992, and a 10 year low of two were awarded in 2001 (APA Research Office, 2004). Supply is meager.

Yet another category of problems raised by practitioners and policy makers is the need for a new generation of teaching materials and curricula that take advantage of expanding knowledge of how people learn and that leverage new delivery mechanisms such as the internet and personal computers (National Research Council, 2000). The design, testing, and implementation of new teaching methods will require scientists who are well trained in cognition, learning, and motivation, and who also are prepared to grapple with the challenges of extending laboratory-derived knowledge of these topics to teaching and learning in complex, real-world environments. Researchers who can straddle the worlds of cognitive science and education practice are needed.

The needs of education policy and practice are served not only by research that directly addresses problem solution but also by research that raises questions and generates hypotheses that can eventually lead to new applications or refinements of existing approaches (National Research Council, 2002). Frequently hypothesis-generating research relies on complex statistical methods that can tease out potential causal influences in large, correlational datasets. Statistical training is also needed in the design and analysis of experimental and quasi-experimental studies, as well as survey and observational data. Although there are many doctoral training programs that focus on applied mathematics and statistics, the application of this expertise to problems in education requires that students be grounded in education content. That, in turn, requires a concentration of students and faculty who are focused on education topics.

To increase the supply of scientists and researchers in education who are prepared to conduct rigorous evaluation studies, develop new products and approaches that are grounded in a science of learning, design valid tests and measures, and explore data with sophisticated statistical methods, this initiative will fund postdoctoral fellowships with academic mentors conducting research in the education sciences. Grants will be awarded to faculty members from disciplines and fields such as education, psychology, political science, economics, statistics, sociology, human development, and epidemiology within qualified institutions of higher education that will provide intensive training in education research and statistics. Postdoctoral students will typically be supported for two years, and will be expected to conduct research on education topics.

#### **4. REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROPOSED TRAINING FELLOWSHIP**

Applicants who intend to revise and resubmit a proposal that was not funded in the Institute's FY 2005 competition must indicate on the application form that their FY 2006 proposal is a revised proposal. Their FY 2005 reviews will be sent to this year's reviewers along with their proposal. Applicants should indicate the revisions that were made to the proposal on the basis of the prior reviews using no more 3 pages of Appendix A.

The proposed training fellowship should include the features listed below.

##### **A. Training Director**

A Training Director will be the head of the training fellowship and is expected to be the primary mentor for the fellows' research and training activities. The Training Director will have overall responsibility for the administration of the award and interactions with the Institute.

The Training Director must be the Principal or Co-Principal Investigator on one or more education research projects, currently supported by the Institute or other funding sources, that are appropriate for postdoctoral level research training. Proposals submitted to this competition must identify the ongoing grant-supported education research of the Training Director, who will serve as the primary mentor for the postdoctoral fellows.

##### **B. Plan for Recruiting U.S. Postdoctoral Fellows**

Applicants must include a plan for recruiting U.S. Postdoctoral fellows, including outreach efforts to encourage applications from members of underrepresented minorities and persons with disabilities. Training Directors are encouraged to consider recruiting fellowship candidates from disciplines other than their own.

Up to two fellows will be supported at any given time and the length of a postdoctoral fellowship typically will be two years. Postdoctoral fellowship candidates must have received their doctorate prior to beginning the fellowship. Postdoctoral fellowship candidates who have received postdoctoral support through other federal training programs must be approved by the Institute before being offered a fellowship. Postdoctoral fellows who have an existing relationship with the Training Director (e.g., dissertation advisor) must be approved by the Institute before being offered a fellowship.

### **C. Plan for Training Postdoctoral Fellows**

The applicant must include a plan for training postdoctoral fellows to conduct rigorous education research. Fellows should gain the breadth of skills and understanding necessary to conduct rigorous applied research in education and develop the capacity to independently carry out such research, including applying for grant funding and submitting results for publication in peer-reviewed journals.

Applicants should clearly specify the role that the fellows will play in the Training Director's education research projects, and how these and other training activities will produce independent researchers capable of developing their own education research programs, seeking grant support, and presenting the results of their research in peer-reviewed forums such as professional conferences and journals. *From the Institute's view, a postdoctoral training program would be successful if it produced education researchers who were able to submit competitive applications to the Institute's research competitions.* Applicants should consider how potential fellows will gain experience and training in the design and implementation of rigorous education research methods and statistical analyses. As appropriate, fellows may audit courses and engage in other training activities that enhance their knowledge and professional skills (e.g., auditing courses in areas not covered in their doctoral training, training in the administration and scoring of research measures).

Fellows' research and training activities must address practical questions in education. It is anticipated that fellows will submit findings from their postdoctoral research activities to peer reviewed forums such as professional conferences and journals. Fellows will attend and present at professional conferences. Fellows are encouraged to work with the Training Director to seek independent grant support for their own research from the Institute or other sources.

### **D. Stipend Support, Travel, and Additional Costs**

The stipend amount for each fellow is \$50,000 per year (12 months) for up to 2 years. A third year of support is possible but will require submission of a request for supplemental funding at the appropriate time and approval by the Institute. All fellowship stipend recipients must be citizens or permanent residents of the United States. Fellows must make satisfactory progress in their research activities in order to remain eligible for fellowship funds. The fellowship must include fringe benefits (e.g., health insurance and normal fees) at the level afforded to other employees of the applicant institution at a similar level and class as the postdoctoral fellows, with the Institute's contribution not to exceed \$10,500 per year per fellow. There are no funds for tuition costs, as fellows are expected to audit any courses that are part of their training.

Funds should be requested to support both Training Director and fellows' travel for one two-day meeting each year in Washington, DC. Funds may be requested up to \$12,000 per year per fellow to defray the costs of recruiting fellows (e.g., advertisements, travel of applicants necessary for interviews), costs of research by fellows (local travel to research sites, materials, personal computer), and fellow registration and travel expenses to attend professional conferences.

Applicants should note that there are no funds for faculty research or salaries through this program. Funds for facility renovation and maintenance are not allowed.

## **5. APPLICATIONS AVAILABLE**

Application forms and instructions for the electronic submission of applications will be available for this research training fellowship no later than June 23, 2005, from the following web site:

<https://ies.constellagroup.com>

## **6. MECHANISM OF SUPPORT**

The Institute intends to award grants for periods up to 4 years pursuant to this request for applications.

## **7. FUNDING AVAILABLE**

The Institute anticipates making awards of approximately \$160,000 per year for 4 years. In no case should a request exceed \$200,000 per year. The amount of the award will depend on the number of fellows to be supported on stipends. The amounts above assume that four fellows will be supported, for 2 years each, but applicants are free to request support for fewer fellows. Although the plans of the Institute include this training grant, awards pursuant to this request for applications are contingent upon the availability of funds and the receipt of a sufficient number of meritorious applications. The number of grants funded depends upon the number of high quality applications submitted.

## **8. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

Academic institutions in the United States and its territories that grant doctoral degrees in fields relevant to education may submit proposals under this competition. The proposed Training Director must be the Principal or Co-Principal Investigator on one or more education research grants currently supported by the Institute or other funding source.

## **9. SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS**

Training Directors will be asked to submit a yearly report due one month prior to the annual meeting assessing the effectiveness of the fellowship and describing the status of fellows, including presentation, publication and grant proposal submissions.

Grant recipients who have not successfully recruited the number of fellows for whom they requested funding will have their continuation funding adjusted as a result.

Research associated with this training fellowship must be relevant to U.S. education. Fellowship recipients are expected to publish or otherwise make publicly available the results of the work supported through this training fellowship.

Postdoctoral fellowship recipients and Training Directors must attend one two-day meeting each year in Washington, DC, with other grantees and Institute staff.

## **10. LETTER OF INTENT**

A letter indicating a potential applicant's intent to submit an application is optional, but encouraged, for each application. The letter of intent must be submitted electronically by the

date listed at the beginning of this document, using the instructions provided at the following web site:

<https://ies.constellagroup.com>

The letter of intent should include a descriptive title and a brief description of the current research projects that the fellows would be part of (about 3,500 characters including spaces, which is approximately one page, single-spaced); and the name, institutional affiliation, address, telephone number and e-mail address of the Training Director. The letter of intent should provide an estimated budget request by year, and a total budget request. Although the letter of intent is optional, is not binding, and does not enter into the review of subsequent applications, the information that it contains allows Institute staff to estimate the potential workload to plan the review.

#### **11. SUBMITTING AN APPLICATION**

Applications must be submitted **electronically by 8:00 p.m. Eastern Time** on the application receipt date, using the ED standard forms and the instructions provided at the following web site:

<https://ies.constellagroup.com>

Application forms and instructions for the electronic submission of applications will be available for this training fellowship no later than June 23, 2005. Potential applicants should check this site for information about the electronic submission procedures that must be followed and the software that will be required.

The application form approved for this training fellowship is OMB Number 1890-0009.

#### **12. CONTENTS AND PAGE LIMITS OF APPLICATION**

All applications and proposals for Institute funding must be self-contained within specified page limitations. Internet Web site addresses (URLs) may not be used to provide information necessary to the review because reviewers are under no obligation to view the Internet sites.

Sections described below, and summarized in Table 1, represent the body of a proposal submitted to the Institute and should be organized in the order listed below. Sections A (ED 424) through H (Budget Narrative) are required parts of the proposal. Section I (Appendix A) is optional. All sections must be submitted electronically.

Observe the page number limitations given in Table 1.

**Table 1**

<b>Section</b>	<b>Page Limit</b>	<b>Additional Information</b>
a. Application for Federal Education Assistance (ED 424)	n/a	
b. Budget Information Non-Construction Programs (ED 524) – Sections A and B	n/a	
c. Budget Information Non-Construction Programs (ED 524) – Section C	n/a	
d. Project Abstract	1	
e. Training Narrative	15	Figures, charts, tables, and diagrams may be included in Appendix A
f. Reference List	no limit	Complete citations, including titles and all authors
g. Curriculum Vita of Key Personnel	no limit	No more than 4 pages for each key person
h. Budget Narrative	no limit	
i. Appendix A	10	

**A. Application for Federal Education Assistance (ED 424)**

The form and instructions are available on the website.

**B. Budget Information Non-Construction Programs (ED 524)—Sections A and B**

The application must include a budget for each year of support requested and a cumulative budget for the full term of requested Institute support. Applicants must provide budget information for each project year using the ED 524 form (a link to the form is provided on the application website at <https://ies.constellagroup.com>). The ED 524 form has three sections: A, B, and C. Instructions for Sections A and B are included on the form.

**C. Budget Information Non-Construction Programs (ED 524)—Section C**

Instructions for ED 524 Section C are as follows. Section C is a document constructed by the applicant and is typically an Excel or Word table. Section C should provide a detailed itemized budget breakdown for each project year, for each budget category listed in Sections A and B. For each person listed in the personnel category, include a listing of percent effort for each project year, as well as the cost. Section C should also include a listing of each piece of equipment, itemization of supplies into separate categories, and itemization of travel requests (e.g. conference travel, etc.) into separate categories. Any other expenses should be itemized by category and unit cost.

U.S. Department of Education policy (34 CFR 75.562 (c)(2)) limits indirect cost reimbursement on a training grant to the recipient's actual indirect costs, as determined by its negotiated indirect cost rate agreement, or eight percent of a modified total direct cost base, whichever amount is less. For the purposes of this competition, a modified total direct cost base is defined as total direct costs less stipends, tuition and related fees, and capital expenditures of \$5,000 or more.



#### **D. Project Abstract**

The *project abstract* is limited to one page, single-spaced (about 3,500 characters including spaces) and should include: (1) The title of the research training fellowship; (2) name and institutional affiliation of the Training Director; (3) number of fellows to be recruited and length of fellowship; (4) brief description of education research currently conducted by the proposed Training Director and opportunities for fellows to be involved in education research; (5) a brief description of the proposed training fellowship, highlighting its key research and educational features.

#### **E. Proposed Training Fellowship Narrative**

Incorporating the requirements outlined under the section on Requirements of the Proposed Training Fellowship, the *training fellowship narrative* provides the majority of the information on which reviewers will evaluate the proposal and should include the following sections (1 through 4) in the order listed below.

a. *Detailed Description of the Proposed Training Fellowship (suggested 8-10 pages).*

Applicants must discuss how the proposed training fellowship will address the issues raised in this request for applications (e.g., describe ongoing lines of education research being conducted by the proposed Training Director and how fellows will play an active role in these research activities). Applicants should describe the overall goals and anticipated impact of the proposed research training fellowship. Applicants should discuss potential career development opportunities to be provided to fellowship recipients. Applicants should list concrete strategies for advertising the training fellowship and recruiting fellows and the approximate number of fellows to be admitted to the training fellowship. Applicants should address how recruitment procedures will encourage the participation of underrepresented minorities and persons with disabilities.

b. *Personnel (suggested 2-3 pages).* Applicants should describe the qualifications of key personnel, including the Training Director, specifying their proposed role in the training fellowship (information on personnel should also be provided in their curriculum vitae).

Applicants should include information on previous postdoctoral fellows who have been trained and/or supported by the Training Director and other faculty who will be mentoring the potential postdoctoral fellows (e.g., number of postdoctoral fellows in past 5 years, average length of the fellowship, current positions of previous fellows). Information on previous postdoctoral fellows may be listed in tabular format in Appendix A.

If specific individuals have been identified to whom fellowships would be offered their curriculum vitae should be included in the application.

c. *Resources (suggested 1-2 pages).* Applicants should provide a description of the resources available to support the training fellowship at the participating institution, including field settings (e.g., schools, software development labs) with which the Training Director has a relationship that could support fellows' research projects.

The training fellowship narrative is limited to the equivalent of 15 pages, where a “page” is 8.5 in. x 11 in., on one side only, with 1 inch margins at the top, bottom, and both sides. Single space all text in the training fellowship narrative. To ensure that the text is easy for reviewers to read and that all applicants have the same amount of available space in which to describe their projects, applicants must adhere to the type size and format specifications for the entire training fellowship narrative including footnotes. See frequently asked questions available at <https://ies.constellagroup.com> on or before June 6, 2005.

Conform to the following four requirements:

- (i) The height of the letters must not be smaller than 12 point;
- (ii) Type density, including characters and spaces, must be no more than 15 characters per inch (cpi). For proportional spacing, the average for any representative section of text must not exceed 15 cpi;
- (iii) No more than 6 lines of type within a vertical inch;
- (iv) Margins, in all directions, must be at least 1 inch.

Applicants should check the type size using a standard device for measuring type size, rather than relying on the font selected for a particular word processing/printer combination. Figures, charts, tables, and figure legends may be smaller in size but must be readily legible. The type size and format used must conform to all four requirements. Small type size makes it difficult for reviewers to read the application. Adherence to type size and line spacing requirements is also necessary so that no applicant will have an unfair advantage, by using small type, or providing more text in their applications. **Note, these requirements apply to the PDF file as submitted.** As a practical matter, applicants who use 12 point Times New Roman without compressing, kerning, condensing or other alterations typically meet these requirements.

Use only black and white in graphs, diagrams, tables, and charts. The application must contain only material that reproduces well when photocopied in black and white.

The 15-page limit does *not* include the ED 424 form, the one-page abstract, the ED 524 form and budget narrative justification, the curriculum vitae, or reference list. Reviewers are able to conduct the highest quality review when applications are concise and easy to read, with pages numbered consecutively.

#### **F. Reference List**

Please include complete citations, including titles and all authors, for literature cited in the training fellowship narrative.

#### **G. Brief Curriculum Vita of Key Personnel**

Abbreviated curriculum vita should be provided for the Training Director and other faculty members involved in research projects that the fellows will participate in. Each vita is limited to 4 pages and should include information sufficient to demonstrate that personnel possess training

and expertise commensurate with their duties. The vita should include current Federal award support, including research and other training grants. If specific individuals have been identified to whom fellowships would be offered their curriculum vitae should be included in this section. The curriculum vita must adhere to the margin, format, and font size requirements described in the training fellowship narrative section.

## **H. Budget Narrative**

The *budget narrative* must provide sufficient detail to allow reviewers to judge whether reasonable costs have been attributed to the training fellowship. It must include the time commitments and brief descriptions of the responsibilities of key faculty. *The budget justification should correspond to the itemized breakdown of project costs that is provided in ED 524 form Section C.* A justification for equipment purchase, supplies, travel and other related project costs should also be provided in the budget narrative for each project year outlined in Section C.

## **I. Appendix A**

The purpose of Appendix A is to allow the applicant to include any figures, charts, or tables that supplement the training fellowship narrative text (e.g., basic information on previous postdoctoral fellows trained by the proposed Training Director). In addition, in the case of a resubmission, the applicant may use up to 3 pages of the appendix to describe the ways in which the revised proposal is responsive to prior reviewer feedback. These are the only materials that may be included in Appendix A; all other materials will be removed prior to review of the application. Appendix A is limited to 10 pages.

Please note that applicants selected for funding will be required to submit the following certifications and assurances before a grant is issued:

- (1) SF 424B - Assurances-Non-Construction Programs
- (2) ED-80-0013 - Certification Regarding Lobbying, Debarment, Suspension and other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements
- (3) ED 80-0014 (if applicable) - Lower Tier Certification
- (4) SF-LLL (if applicable) - Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

## **13. APPLICATION PROCESSING**

Applications must be received by **8:00 p.m. Eastern time** on the application receipt date listed in the heading of this request for applications. Upon receipt, each application will be reviewed for completeness and for responsiveness to this request for applications. Applications that do not address specific requirements of this request will be returned to the applicants without further consideration.

## **14. PEER REVIEW PROCESS**

Applications that are complete and responsive to this request will be evaluated for scientific and pedagogical merit. Reviews will be conducted in accordance with the review criteria stated below by a panel of scientists who have substantive expertise appropriate to the request for applications.

Each application will be assigned to at least two primary reviewers who will complete written evaluations of the application, identifying strengths and weaknesses related to each of the review criteria. Primary reviewers will independently assign a score for each criterion, as well as an overall score, for each application they review. Based on the overall scores assigned by primary reviewers, an average overall score for each application will be calculated and a preliminary rank order of applications prepared before the full peer review panel convenes to complete the review of applications.

The full panel will consider and score only those applications deemed to be the most competitive and to have the highest merit, as reflected by the preliminary rank order. A panel member may nominate for consideration by the full panel any proposal that he or she believes merits full panel review but would not have been included in the full panel meeting based on its preliminary rank order.

## **15. REVIEW CRITERIA**

The goal of Institute-supported programs is to contribute to the solution of education problems and to provide reliable information about the education practices that support learning and improve academic achievement and access to education for all students. Reviewers will be expected to assess the following aspects of an application in order to judge the likelihood that the proposed research training fellowship will have a substantial impact on the pursuit of that goal. Information pertinent to each of these criteria is also described above in the section on Requirements of the Proposed Training Fellowship and in the description of the training fellowship narrative, which appears in the section on Contents and Page Limits of Application.

Significance	Does the applicant make a compelling case for the potential contribution of the proposed research training fellowship? Are the Training Director's research projects likely to advance the scholarly development of the participating fellows?
Fellowship Plan	Does the applicant present (a) a strong plan for the proposed research training fellowship, including the role that fellows will play in ongoing research projects; (b) a clear orientation that emphasizes rigorous training in research methodology and statistics; and (c) an emphasis on research that addresses practical problems in education? Does the proposed plan meet the requirements described in the section on the Requirements of the Proposed Training Fellowship and in the description of the training fellowship narrative in the section on Contents and Page Limits?
Personnel	Does the description of the personnel make it apparent that the Training Director and other faculty possess the training and experience and will commit sufficient time to competently implement the proposed training fellowship?
Resources	Does the applicant have the facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources required to support the proposed training activities?

## **16. RECEIPT AND REVIEW SCHEDULE**

Letter of Intent Receipt Date: June 6, 2005  
Application Receipt Date: July 21, 2005, 8:00 p.m. Eastern time  
Earliest Anticipated Start Date: March 1, 2006

## **17. AWARD DECISIONS**

The following will be considered in making award decisions:

Overall strength of the proposed training fellowship as determined by peer review  
Responsiveness to the requirements of this request  
Performance and use of funds under a previous Federal award  
Contribution to the overall goals described in this request  
Availability of funds

## **18. INQUIRIES MAY BE SENT TO:**

Dr. James Griffin  
Institute of Education Sciences  
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW  
Suite 611a  
Washington, DC 20208

Email: James.Griffin@ed.gov  
Telephone: (202) 219-2280

## **19. PROGRAM AUTHORITY**

20 U.S.C. 9501 et seq., the "Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002," Title I of Public Law 107-279, November 5, 2002. This program is not subject to the intergovernmental review requirements of Executive Order 12372.

## **20. APPLICABLE REGULATIONS**

The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR parts 74, 77, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86 (part 86 applies only to institutions of higher education), 97, 98, and 99. In addition 34 CFR part 75 is applicable, except for the provisions in 34 CFR 75.100, 75.101(b), 75.102, 75.103, 75.105, 75.109(a), 75.200, 75.201, 75.209, 75.210, 75.211, 75.217, 75.219, 75.220, 75.221, 75.222, and 75.230.

## **21. REFERENCES**

American Educational Research Association (AERA). (2002). *Demographic characteristics of AERA membership in 2001-2002*. Retrieved December 23, 2003 from <http://www.aera.net/about/reports/annual/02/tables.pdf>.

American Psychological Association, Research Office (2004). *2001 Doctorate Employment Survey*. Report by Jessica Kohout and Marlene Wicherski. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Boruch, R., de Moya, D., and Snyder, B. (2001). The importance of randomized field trials in

education and related fields. In R. Boruch and F. Mosteller (Eds.). *Evidence Matters*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy. (2002, November). Rigorous evidence: The key to progress in education? Lessons from medicine, welfare and other fields. *Proceedings of The Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy Forum*, Washington, DC.

Cook, T.D. (2001). Sciencephobia: Why education researchers reject randomized experiments. *Education Next*. Retrieved January 5 from [www.educationnext.org](http://www.educationnext.org).

Hoffer, T.B., S. Sederstrom, L. Selfa, V. Welch, M. Hess, S. Brown, S. Reyes, K. Webber, and I. Guzman-Barron. (2003). *Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities: Summary Report 2002*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center. (The report provides the results of data collected in the Survey of Earned Doctorates, conducted for six Federal agencies, NSF, NIH, USED, NEH, USDA, and NASA by NORC.).

National Research Council. (1999). *Improving student learning: A strategic plan for education Research and its utilization*. Committee on a Feasibility Study for a Strategic Education Research Program. Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

National Research Council. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience and school*. Committee on Developments in the Science of Learning. J. Bransford, A. Brown, and R. Cocking (Eds.). Committee on Learning Research and Educational Practice. S. Donovan, J. Bransford, and J. Pellegrino (Eds.). Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences in Education. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

National Research Council (2002). *Scientific research in education*. Committee on Scientific Principles for Education Research. R.J. Shavelson and L. Towne (Eds.). Center for Education. Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.